Serial No.: 09/892,071

## **REMARKS**

Claims 45-61 are presently pending and under examination. Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60 have been cancelled herein. Claims 45, 47, 49 and 51 have been amended to incorporate the elements of canceled claims 55, 56, 58 and 60. No new matter has been added by the amendments, which were discussed with the Examiner and his supervisor during the telephonic interview conducted on December 13, 2004. Thus, following entry of the amendment, claims 45-54, 57, 59 and 61 will be pending and under consideration.

## **Regarding the Telephonic Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank Examiners Chism and Tate for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative and Dr. Michael Pierschbacher during the telephonic interview conducted on December 13, 2004. During the interview, Applicants' representative indicated Applicants' intent to recite "cyclic" peptides in claims 45, 47, 49 and 51 in order to pursue coverage for cyclic peptides. Examiner Chism indicated that incorporation of dependent claims 55, 56, 58 and 60 into their corresponding base claims 45, 47, 49 and 51, would render moot the rejection of claims 45, 47, 49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Hayman et al., *J. Cell Biol.* 100: 1948-1954 (1985).

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 45, 47, 49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Hayman et al., *J. Cell Biol.* 100: 1948-1954 (1985).

As set forth previously on the record, Applicants maintain that Hayman et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention of claims 45, 47, 49 and 51. Nevertheless, the rejection has now been rendered moot by amendment of claims 45, 47, 49 and 51, which now recite cyclic peptides.

Serial No.: 09/892,071

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of claims 45, 47,

49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Hayman et al., J. Cell Biol. 100:

1948-1954 (1985).

**Regarding Double-Patenting** 

Claims 45-61 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type

double patenting over claims 45-42 and 61-68 of U.S. Patent No. 5,981,468. Applicants will

submit a Supplemental Response for the purpose of submitting a Terminal Disclaimer of U.S.

Patent No. 5,981,468 within the next few weeks.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Amendments and Remarks herein, Applicants submit that the claims are in

condition for allowance and respectfully request a notice to this effect. Should the Examiner

have any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby

made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit

account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Please recognize our Customer No. 41552

as our correspondence address.

Astrid R. Spain

Registration No. 47,956

4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700

San Diego, CA 92122

Phone: 858.535.9001 ARS:cej:cec

Facsimile: 858.597.1585

Date: December 29, 2004

6